

REMARKS

Claims 8, 10, 11, 19, 21, 22, and 29 to 52 are pending, of which claims 8, 19 and 29 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 8, 9, 11, 19, 20, 22 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,855,934 (Robinson); and claims 10, 21 and 30 were rejected under §103 over Robinson and "Official Notice". As shown above, Applicants have amended the independent claims to include limitations of cancelled dependent claims. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, withdrawal of the art rejections is requested.

Each of the independent claims has been amended to include determining a size of a texture map area based on an eyepoint vector to the silhouette edge, where the size of the texture map area is determined so that its width is orthogonal to the eyepoint vector and to its height. As explained on page 8 of the specification, one advantage of determining the size of the texture map area in this manner is that resulting texture maps can be viewed from the same perspective.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of the independent claims. In this regard, it was said on page 3 of the Office Action that

[t]he TE vector between texture coordinates and eye coordinates has a vertical component that is perpendicular to the origin of eye space and the xy plane of texture space (column 6, lines 15-30). Perpendicular means right angles, which means orthogonal.

While Applicants may not dispute that Robinson discloses what is described, Applicants disagree with the insinuation that the cited disclosure of Robinson corresponds to the size of a texture map area being determined so that its width is orthogonal to an eyepoint vector and to its height.

More specifically, in Robinson, a contour map is projected from texture space 34 to pixel space 36. The pixel of interest in Figs. 3 and 4 is pixel P, since the contour map (like the silhouette edge in the claims) is being rendered. The eyepoint vector in Figs. 3 and 4 of Robinson, therefore, is the vector that goes from the origin E, through pixel P, to point I of texture space 34. This vector is labeled EI in Figs. 3 and 4.

Vector EI is not orthogonal to the width of texture space 34, which is defined along the XY plane starting at origin 35, or even to pixel P in pixel space 36. While it is true vector TEZ is orthogonal to texture space 34 (as indicated in the Office Action), the vector TEZ is not the eyepoint vector (i.e., the vector to the silhouette edge or, in this case, its counterpart, the contour map). That vector TEZ may be related to vector EI is irrelevant here, since the claims call for the width to be orthogonal to the eyepoint vector, not some component thereof.

Thus, Applicants submit that Robinson does not disclose or suggest determining a size of a texture map area based on an eyepoint vector to the silhouette edge, where the size of the texture map area is determined so that its width is orthogonal to the eyepoint vector and to its height. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that independent claims 8, 19 and 29, and the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable over the applied art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Please charge any fees due for this Amendment, including claims fees, to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-593001.

Applicants : Adam T. Lake, et al.
Serial No. : 09/996,451
Filed : November 28, 2001
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-046002
Intel Docket No.: P7405D

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2004



Paul A. Rysher
Reg. No. 40,780

ATTORNEYS FOR INTEL
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20779778.doc